

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 12, 2007, has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 6 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action stated that the phrase "downloading the object without generating an error" is not supported by the disclosure.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification, at page 16, lines 15-16, describes that objects may be captured in printer capture storage 180. On page 20, at lines 20-22, the specification states that resources may be captured if the printer has sufficient storage to save the resources. In addition, on page 20, at lines 22-25, the printer may be delete resources to make room to capture downloaded objects. Moreover, the specification states various instances for "downloading the object without generating an error." For example, at page 25, lines 7-9, the printer is allowed to download an object unless the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object does not match the globally-unique identifier referenced and is therefore an error condition that should be indicated.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides sufficient support and description under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for the limitation recited in claim 18.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 7 on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure that is not enabling. The Office Action stated that

the specification does not enable or adequately describe how or when an object is to be downloaded.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification, at pages 15-16, describes the operation of the AFP print server and the AFP control unit. Further, the specification at page 20, line 14, states that whenever a resource is downloaded from the print server to the printer, it is cached. Still further, the specification at page 20, lines 20-22, that resources may be captured if the resource is made capturable and if sufficient storage is available to save the resources. Still further, the specification relating to the description of the flowcharts associated Fig. 4-7 discloses, in detail, the processes for downloading an object.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides sufficient support under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph to enable the limitation recited in claim 18.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 9 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18, as amended, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In paragraph 11 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Seto et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to overcome the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submit that Seto et al. fail to teach each and every element of claims 1 and 26 as amended.

Dependent claims 2-18 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Further dependent claims 2-18 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-18 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel  
1000 Tallan Building  
Two Union Square  
Chattanooga, TN 37402  
423-757-0264

By: 

Name: David W. Lynch  
Reg. No.: 36,204